



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Witt
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/675,265

09/28/2000

Thomas W. Jewitt

003551.P007

1008

7590

08/22/2006

Dennis A. Nicholls
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/675,265

Applicant(s)

JEWITT, THOMAS W.

Examiner

Stephen M. Brinich

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1, 16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-15 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2625

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stansfield et al (EP 0301786).

Re claims 1 & 20, Stansfield et al discloses (Figure 3; column 3, line 34 - column 4, line 9) a halftone descreening arrangement in which a first descreening filter operation (32, 33) is applied to an image to produce an intermediate image, after which a low pass (i.e. smoothing) filter (34) is applied to the resulting intermediate image to produce an output image.

Further re claims 1 & 20, while it is noted that the low pass filter 34 is not specifically confined to "line smoothing", the current claim language does not require that lines *and only lines* are smoothed by the line smoothing filter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 16 & 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stansfield et al.

Re claims 16& 18-19, Stansfield et al does not describe the use of a computer-readable medium bearing sequences of instructions for carrying out the above described process.

Art Unit: 2625

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to implement a known method in the form of computer software stored on a computer-readable medium.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enable the method to be practiced by loading the program into a general-purpose computer, thus avoiding the need for specific hardware for its implementation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the well-known concept of computer software with Stansfield et al to obtain the invention as specified in claims 18-19.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 21-22 are allowed.

5. Claims 2-15, 17, & 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Re claim 21 (and dependent claim 22), as noted by Applicant (5/30/06 Remarks: page 9, line 21 - page 10, line 16), the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited filter for converting halftone dots to parallel lines of an intermediate

Art Unit: 2625

image in conjunction with the recited smoothing of the parallel lines to produce a final image.

Re claims 2, 7, 12-15, 17, & 22 (and dependent claims 3-6 & 8-11), the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited filter configuration in conjunction with a screen conversion filter for producing an intermediate image followed by a line smoothing filter to produce an output image.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments in the Response filed 5/30/06 with respect to claim 21 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC §103 and the rejection of claim 21 under 35 USC §102 been withdrawn.

8. Applicant's arguments filed 5/30/06 with respect to claims 1, 16, & 18-20 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Re claims 1, 16, & 18-20, Applicant argues (5/30/06 Remarks: page 8, line 1 - page 9, line 20 and page 11, line 17 - page 13, line 7) that Stansfield et al does not teach or suggest performing a screen conversion filter or convolution filter on a binary representation of an image, but rather discloses stepping a window across the binary representation (and summing the pixels within the window as described by Stansfield et al at column 3, lines 39-41).

Art Unit: 2625

However, the recited "screen conversion filter" of claims 1 & 18-20 or "convolution filter" of claim 16 does not appear to include any limitation that rules out a reading of this term on the summing of a pixel window (as the latter operation is clearly equivalent to applying a filter of a size equal to the pixel window and coefficients all equal to +1).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning the contents of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430.

Art Unit: 2625

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding or any inquiry of a general nature concerning application processing should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 571-272-1000.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 8:00-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

The examiner's unit designation has been changed from "Art Unit 2624" to "Technology Division 2625" (as of March 20, 2006).

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 571-273-8300 (as of July 15, 2005).

Hand-carried correspondence may be delivered to the Customer Service Window, located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Stephen M Brinich
Examiner
Technology Division 2625

smb 
August 9, 2006



THOMAS D.
~~LEE~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER